



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lengths in the publication of criminal intelligence. It exerts an enormous influence in the development of crime and has become a menace to the security of our individual and national life. Its pages are the most powerful incentives to crime, and are quite as injurious to the welfare of our people as are the open doors of the brothel and the saloon. If we can regulate the one by law, we can and should reach and control the other by the same instrumentality. The time has come when journalism must be restrained by the strong hand of the law. The true "freedom of the press" will not thus be abridged. There is no liberty guaranteed by our national principles to any man to endanger the life, liberty, or happiness of his fellow-citizens in order to gratify his own greed of gain. A bill lately before the legislature of New York provided that "any person who conducts a paper which corrupts, depraves, degrades, or injures, or has a tendency to corrupt, deprave, degrade, or injure the mind or morals of the public, or of its readers, or of the people among whom it circulates, is guilty of a misdemeanor." Such a law, wisely framed and with heavy penalties attached, should be enacted and enforced in every State of the Union.

5. We cannot but feel that, after all, Professor Lombroso has omitted all mention of the most needful and effective of all remedies for the prevention of homicide, namely, the Christian religion. Surely it must be acknowledged that Christianity has been the most consistent and powerful champion of the sacredness of human life which the world has ever seen. All the world over we can measure the value and safety of human life by simply determining the hold which Christianity has upon the people in that locality. It has been abundantly proved in all ages that a high degree of civilization does not guarantee safety of life and limb. The histories of France and Rome are eloquent upon this theme. After all that has been said and done, the only force which can be depended upon to control the settlers of our new lands, the alien multitudes of our immigrants from foreign shores, and our half-civilized millions of emancipated slaves, and to restrain them from crime, is the Christian religion. Until this is brought home to them in all its purity and power, the terrible crime of homicide will continue to be a blot upon the fair face of American civilization.

WYLLYS REDE.

BOYS' CLUBS.

MAY I, as well as Mr. Sanborn, occupy a little space in the *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, with a discussion of "Boys, and Boys' Clubs?" Only through open discussion, and much comparing of notes and experiences, will it be possible to discover some satisfactory system for running our Boys' Clubs, and until this system shall have been found, I cannot believe the last word on education has been spoken.

Mr. Robert Herbert Quick says that the fourfold results of education are (or should be) virtue, wisdom, good manners and learning. It is clear that the greater part of the time spent in schools must be devoted to learning only, for, although at the present time no more facts are taught there than are necessary, yet complaints are often heard that children in school are "crammed" and overworked. Where, when, and how, then, are virtue, wisdom, and good manners to be taught those children particularly whose families, or whose surroundings, make these things exceedingly difficult of attainment.

Let us suppose that we gather together eight or ten boys between the ages of twelve and thirteen years. We give them the use of a large room, and we provide them with a few games. The room becomes to them a tiny world, in which there are many opportunities to be found by those with imaginations, and many limitations visible to all. The boys have here the same rights and opportunities, and are equal in everything but natural endowments. Each boy can do what he likes to amuse himself, up to the point where he interferes with some other boy's effort to do the same thing, or where he damages property in the room; and each game must obey the same law and adapt itself to the requirements of other games, and to the limitations of the room.

All games—but particularly rough ones—teach many valuable lessons to the child. In them all self control and sweet temper are necessary. In the quiet games are learned, as Mr. Sanborn has said, concentration and application.* In rough games the first precious lessons in co-operation are learned, for a boy can be made to see that his side is less likely to win if he plays only for his personal glory. He learns, too, that it is better for his game, as a whole, if the weaker and more stupid players are helped and encouraged rather than snubbed and put out of the way.

When eight or ten boys have a place in which they can play, and a grown person with them who never interferes and yet who shows them how it is practicable for all to do what they want to do, it is probable that other boys in the neighborhood will also wish to enjoy these advantages. The question then arises, ought we to let in all indiscriminately? As Mr. Sanborn has said very truly, it were better to leave them to their not altogether vicious street life, than to "coop them (the boys) good and bad together within four walls, *unless somehow—by force of rigid discipline, persuasion, and affection, it matters not how, they are trained in the essential qualities of right living.*" The street *per se*, indeed, does not exert an evil influence, and it has, in its great space and comparative fresh air, an advantage over any room. But, when the "good" and the "bad" are "cooped together" or thrown together anywhere, it is sure to be bad for the "good." I do not agree with that part of Mr. Sanborn's sentence which I have italicized.

Mr. Sanborn will agree, I think, that the "essential qualities of right living" are virtue, wisdom, good manners, and learning. Rigid discipline rarely produces virtue or wisdom, even though it may aid good manners, and to rely on affection alone—although it must exist as a matter of course between the boys and their director—to produce the desired qualities, would result, I fear, in frequent failures. In the first place, instead of "cooping the good and the bad together," it would be better to keep out the bad; and, in the second place, the best system for teaching the "essential qualities of right living" to those boys—by no means angels—who are allowed into the club, is to give them a system of self-government.

One may say, quite justly, how can one decide who is bad and who is good? Truly it is a difficult question to answer. But for a Boys' Club I

*I must dispute the correctness of his statement that inapplication and irresponsibility are characteristics of "poor children." Our slums in all cities are populated with refugees from many lands, and their children's characteristics vary with the race to which they belong. For instance, after eight years' experience among the children of Polish and Russian Jews in New York, I should say that inapplication and irresponsibility are not by any means noticeable deficiencies among them.

should say without hesitation, keep out those boys who steal or gamble. Boys who are incapable of love, gratitude or pity—they are very rare, happily—are more truly bad than the thieves and gamblers, who are usually more the result of environment than of inborn viciousness. But, for a Club, it is better to keep out boys of the latter class for several reasons. In the first place, stealing and gambling are the commonest sins indulged in by street boys, and they are by far the most dangerous in their results. But, above all, the danger to a Club in admitting such boys is, that stealing and gambling are very contagious. The boys already in the club, however, must be made to understand that the so-called “bad boys” are not barred out from the Club as a punishment. A self-righteous attitude on the part of the members would be worse than the bad habits they condemned. They must know that a Club exerts a great influence in the neighborhood, and that this influence can only be a good one if the Club records itself on all occasions as being opposed to such dangerous practices as stealing and gambling.

Although a good Club will have a great influence with outside boys, within its own four walls it does its most important work. The boys who are admitted as members, although they do not steal or gamble, yet need to be taught the “essential qualities of right living,” and, as I have said before, a better means to accomplish this end than rigid discipline, persuasion or affection is self-government. When new boys apply for admission this event brings about a condition of affairs in which the simple playing of games no longer fulfils the requirements of club government. The problem of what to do with these applicants is the first, which requires more than the brief suggestion of the director and the momentary attention of the Club. Out of this problem grows the necessity for their having a government of their own. If the boys are to have real self-government they must be given the chance to discuss their problems, and cast their votes. Therefore, after their games, an hour is devoted to a business meeting, which is conducted entirely by the boys.

The most apparent virtue of the business meeting is the power to cure the shyest boy of his self-consciousness. In talking, as the boys are impelled to, before a number of people on the interesting, and often exciting topics concerning the Club, the most nervous boy soon gains confidence and fluency. To be able to express one's ideas in public is an accomplishment of great practical value to every man and woman in this country, but there is a higher end to be obtained through this means. Parliamentary law, without which an orderly meeting is scarcely possible, is the very embodiment of justice and good manners, while the necessity for making, unassisted, wise decisions in the questions of the Club, develops, in a certain degree, wisdom. Prof. J. R. Seeley, in his *Lectures and Essays*, says: “Train and perfect the gift of speech, unfold all that is in it, and you train at the same time the power of thought and of intellectual sympathy.”

I will quote an experience which shows how, through the constant friction and polishing of the social life of the Club, such virtues as the boys possess grow slowly to be of finer and more sensitive quality. It was the custom in one club for the boys to organize each year an entertainment. All the boys had tickets to sell for this performance, and it was their custom to attack strangers from up town, friends of their parents—in short, anyone whom they could beguile into buying one or a dozen tickets, quite regardless of whether their victims intended to use these tickets or not. As

the entertainment was solely for the benefit of the boys' own club, their director disapproved of this method of levying contributions. She dropped a hint to that effect, but it fell on deaf ears. So she waited. Two years later, one of the more thoughtful boys rose at the meeting and protested against this manner of selling tickets. "It isn't exactly dishonest," he said, tentatively; "I guess it isn't high-toned." And the Club as one man agreed with him, and the system was abolished.

In this short article it would be impossible to do more than suggest a few of the possibilities of a Boys' Club. I believe, however, that some day volumes will be written on the subject, and that the ideal club will be a recognized and necessary factor in every child's education.

WINIFRED BUCK.